Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

05 143 MAY 26 2005

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 04-2651

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

ROSEMARY A. GILROY
Plaintiff

v.

DAVID LETTERMAN; CRAIG KILBORNE; & CBS BROADCAST, INC.
Respondent

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

May 24, 2005

Rosemary A. Gilroy
Plaintiff Pro Se
107 Ponemah Road
Unit #1
Amherst, N.H. 03031
603-672-8412

II. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Defendants violated Plaintiff's Constitutional Rights, Civil Liberties and Civil Rights when the Defendants invaded Plaintiff's Privacy, when the Defendants had Invaded the Privacy of Plaintiff, had been involved in a Conspiracy to Invade Plaintiff's Privacy, and had commit the numerous illegal activities which Plaintiff claimed in Plaintiff's Complaint.

2. Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First District and the U.S. District Court for the District of N.H. made erroneous decisions when the courts ruled against the Plaintiff.

3. Whether the United States Supreme Court will find that the date Plaintiff first actually "knew" of Invasion of Plaintiff's Privacy by Defendants was 2003 because Plaintiff had been "suspicious" in 1999 but did not actually "know" until 2003, thereby extending the beginning of the accrual of the statute of limitations to 2003.

4. Whether Petitioner had been "Intimidated" by Defendants into not filing Petitioner's Complaint sooner, thereby extending the statute of limitations.

5. Whether "...The defendant's wrongful conduct caused a mental condition ..." which resulted in the Plaintiff's delay in filing the suit."

6. Whether the damage to Petitioner's Cerebellum due to a Stroke in the early 1990's (and subsequent repetitions of Strokes) which caused damage to Plaintiff's memory, thereby delaying Petitioner's filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, will extend the statute of limitations, which had been ruled by the U.S. District Court to be 1999, to 2004 or longer, in order that the Petitioner's case and Complaint will not be dismissed.

7. Whether the other reasons stated by Petitioner in "Arguments, B. Statute of Limitation" are viable reasons to

extend the statute of limitations from 1999 to 2003, or 2004 or longer.

8. Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals made an erroneous decision when the court "denied" Petitioner's "Motion" to allow Petitioner to submit photographic evidence to support Plaintiff's claims because Petitioner had already referred to the photographic and other evidence in Motions to the U.S. District Court and in Plaintiff's "Complaint."

9. Whether the District Court erred when the court ruled that the Plaintiff "failed to state a claim" because "... she cannot prove facts to support her claims."

10. Whether the District Court erred when the court ruled that the Plaintiff "... failed to state a claim..." because "... her claims are barred by the statute of limitations ...."

11. Whether the Federal District Court erred in ruling "... therefore, her complaint must be dismissed."

12. Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals erred when the court ruled to "affirm" the decisions of the U.S. District Court.

13. Whether the United States District Court made an erroneous decision when the court ruled the Plaintiff is "delusional."

14. Whether the United States Court of Appeals made an erroneous decision when the court "Affirmed" the district court's decisions.

15. Whether the "Fraud" of Defendants against Plaintiff (see Petitioner's "Complaint" in "Causes of Action") caused delay in the filing of Complaint by Plaintiff, thereby causing the beginning of the accrual of the statute of limitations to have been extended into 2004 or longer.

16. Whether "Intentional torts based on abuse" of Plaintiff by Defendants (See Petitioner's "Complaint," "Causes of Action") caused delay of Plaintiff in filing of Complaint.

17. Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit made an erroneous decision when the court Affirmed the U.S. District Court for the District of N.H.'s Decision and granted "Summary Disposition" to the Defendants without allowing Plaintiff / Petitioner time to file Petitioner's "Reply Brief" and because "Summary Disposition is not generally granted unless the case had been dismissed Sua Sponte," which did not occur in Petitioner's case.

III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

A. Accord grier v. Reagan, Civ. A. No. 86-0724 1986 WL 3948 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 1, 1998)(page 18) (Page 27, Appeal Brief).....Footnote, p.22

B. Apple v. Glen, 183 F.3d at 479 (Page 26, Appeal Brief)..... P.22,23

C. Bloch v. Ribar, 156 F.3rd 673, 677 (6th Cir. 1998) (Page 27, Appeal Brief)..... Footnote, p.23

D. Brown v. Bargery,207 F. 3d 863, 864,(6th Cir. 2000). (Page 26, Appeal Brief)..... p.21, Footnote, p.23

E. Chapman v. City of Detroit, 808 F.2d 459, 465... (6th Cir. 1986)(page 10)(Page 27, Appeal Brief) p.23, Footnote, p.23

F. Collyer v. Darling, 98 F.3d, 211, 213 (6th Cir. 1996) (page 12) (Conspiracy law).....Footnote, p.24 (Page 27, Appeal Brief)

G. Florida Statutes, Section 95.031, (Supp. 2000) .....(See Page 19, Appeal Brief)

H. Florida Statutes, Intentional Torts based on Abuse; s. 39.01, s. 415.102; (See Page 19, Appeal Brief)

I. Griffin v. Breckenridge, 403 U.S. 88 (1971)) ..... Page 12, last paragraph.

(See Page 27, Appeal Brief)

J. Gutierrez v. Lunch, 826 F.2d 1534, 1538 (6th Cir. 1987) .....Footnote, p.23 (See Page 27, Appeal Brief)

K. Hearndon, 767 So 2d at 1185-86..... (See Page 19, Appeal Brief)

L. Hogans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) (page 8) (See Page 27, Appeal Brief).....p.23

M. Lawler v. Marshall, 898 F. 2d 1196, 1198-99 (6th Cir. 1990). (page 6); (See Page 26, Appeal Brief) .....Footnote, p.21

N. Mallon v. Padova, 806 F. Supp. 1189, 1191-92 (E.D. Pa. 1992);(See Page 26, Appeal Brief) .....Footnote, p.21,22

O. McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 612 (6th Cir. 1997)(page 7); (See Page 26, Appeal Brief)

P. Monahan v. Davis, 781 So 2d 436 (Fla 4th DCA 2001)(See Page 18, Appeal Brief)

Q. Monahan v. Davis, 781 So 2d 436 (Fla 4th DCA 2001).(See Page 19, Appeal Brief)

R. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). (See Page 26, Appeal Brief).....Footnote, p.21

S. Paratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 ...footnote, p.23 (1981))(Page 9, paragraph 2) (See Page 27, Appeal Brief)

T. Robinson v. Love, 155 F.r.D. 535, 535 (E.D. Pa. 1994); .....footnote, p.21 (See Page 26, Appeal Brief)

U. Supreme Court of Florida, Delayed Discovery Doctrine; (See Page 18, Appeal Brief)

V. U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Northern Division in the case of Plaintiff, Chad Gabriel Dekoven, a.k.a. "Messiah-God' #145274; Docket #01-10124-BC .....p.19,20,21,22 (See Page 24, Appeal Brief)

W. U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Northern Division; case number 01-10124-BC; April 26, 2001; Opinion; (page 21);..Footnotes, 19-22
(See Page 24, Appeal Brief)

X. U.S. District Court, Eastern District, Michigan , Northern Division; case number 01-10124-BC; April 26, 2001(page 21);.....Footnotes, 19,20,21,22
(See Page 27, Appeal Brief)

Y. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia; ..... Statute of Limitations, pages 1 and 2." (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute of limitations);.....
(See Page 16, Appeal Brief)

Z. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia..... Statute of Limitations, pages 1 and 2." (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute of limitations);
(See Page 17, Appeal Brief)

AA. United States Constitution.....Appendix

BB. Amendments, United States Constitution..Appendix

STATUTE INVOLVED

1. United States Constitution
2. Amendments to the United States Constitution
3. Conspiracy Law
4. Statute of Limitations
5. Section 95.031, Florida Statutes (Supp. 2000)
6. Civil Rights L.; 42 U.S.C.@ 1983
7. Massachusetts General Laws
8. New Hampshire State Statutes Annotated

IV. TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....i
II. QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... ii
III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv
STATUTE INVOLVED..... v
OPINIONS BELOW.....vi
IV. TABLE OF CONTENTS.....vi
V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF..... 2
VI. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT..... 2
VII. STATEMENT OF CASE..... 3
VIII. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 6
IX. ARGUMENTS..... 10
A. FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE . 11
B. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS RULE.....13

1. DELAYED DISCOVERY DOCTRINE: EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS..... 13

2. HOWARD STERN & DOUG STEVENS INTERNET PHOTOGRAPH OF 2003 15

3. THE CONDITION STILL EXISTS:.....17 DELAYED DISCOVERY DOCTRINE. EXTENSION OF TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS: SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

4. INTIMIDATION of PLAINTIFF:.....17 EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

5. EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES:.....17 EXTENSION OF STATUTE of LIMITATION

IX. ARGUMENTS

C. "DELUSIONAL" GIVEN as REASON FOR...18 ERRONEOUS DISMISSAL

1. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT of NEW HAMPSHIRE, ERRED.....18
2. PROOF OF PLAINTIFF'S SANITY TO DISPROVE "DELUSIONAL" REASON TO DISMISS.....18
   a. MEDICAL OPINION that PLAINTIFF IS NOT DELUSIONAL.....18
   b. PLAINTIFF'S WORKLOAD; BUSINESS PERSONS PLAINTIFF DAILY MEETS.. 18
   c. EMERGENCY ROOM PHYSICIANS.....19 WOULD NOT ALLOW PLAINTIFF TO LEAVE E.R. IF DELUSIONAL
3. COMPARISON of ACTUALLY DELUSIONAL PLAINTIFFS to PLAINTIFF & PLAINTIFF'S "COMPLAINT".....19

   a. CLAIMS OF ACTUALLY DELUSIONAL PLAINTIFFS.....19
   b. CIVIL RIGHTS LAW.....23
4. METHODS, TRANSMITTING AUDIO-VISUAL INFORMATION.....24
5. PLAINTIFF'S LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF TECHNOLOGY.....24

IX. ARGUMENTS

D. ERRONEOUS DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: OTHER REASONS.....24

1. UNPOPULAR SUBJECTS: THE BASIS

COURTS MAY USE FOR DISMISSAL:.....24
2. DISTRICT COURT ERRONEOUS DECISION:25
3. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT'S ERRONEOUS DECISION "FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM "....25
4. PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF.....25
5. SUMMARY DISPOSITION GRANTING: NOT SUA SPONTE.....25

IX. ARGUMENT

E. EVIDENCE.....26

1. DISMISSAL of FIVE CO-CONSPIRATORS on FIVE OCCASIONS 26
2. PUBLISHED PHOTOGRAPHS of PLAINTIFF
   a. PUBLISHED PHOTOGRAPHS of PLAINTIFF.....26
   b. DAMAGE PHOTOGRAPHS CAUSED TO PLAINTIFF.....28
3. HOWARD STERN.....28
   a. HOWARD STERN MONITOR INCIDENT,TELEVISED 1999.....28
   b. PHOTOGRAPH of HOWARD STERN WITH DOUG STEVENS.....28
   c. HANDBILL FROM BLUE MAN GROUP, w/ STEVENS ADVERTISING AGENCY.28
4. CRAIG KILBORNE'S REMOVAL FROM CBS BROADCAST, INC., EARLY OCTOBER, 2004..29
5. WINE BOTTLES ON DESK OF DAVID LETTERMAN.....29
6. OTHER EVIDENCE TO DEMONSTRATE AT TRIAL IN COURT.....29

   a. TELEGRAM to CHARLES LAQUIDARA.....30

b. CALENDAR, 2003: "ASS GOOD ASS IT GETS".30
c. WBCN STATION MANAGER..... 31

7. CHANGES TO DEFENDANTS' TELEVISED PROGRAMS 30
8. MEDICAL OPINION That PLAINTIFF IS NOT DELUSIONAL.....30
9. EVIDENCE - WITNESSES.....30
10. TELEVISED STATEMENTS of DEFENDANTS, QUOTED: PARTIAL LIST from COMPLAINT...30 (See Addendum)

X. CONCLUSION..... 30

XI. APPENDIX ..... 31 .

1. JUDGMENT from U.S. DISTRICT COURT for the DISTRICT of NEW HAMPSHIRE.....
2. JUDGEMENT from U.S. COURT OF APPEALS for the FIRST DISTRICT.....
3. MANDATED JUDGMENT from U.S. COURT of APPEALS.....
4. U.S. COURT of APPEALS "DENIAL" of PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION: Dated MARCH 24, 2005.....
5. PLAINTIFF'S APPEAL BRIEF.....
6. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION to U.S. DISTRICT COURT: JANUARY 26, 2005.....
7. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION of RECONSIDERATION to U.S. COURT OF APPEALS: MARCH 8, 2005.....
8. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION of RECONSIDERATION to U.S. COURT OF APPEALS: MARCH 23, 2005.....

9. PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: On File in the U.S. District Court for the District of N.H.....
10. UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: Relevant Pages.....
11. UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: Relevant Amendments.....

XII. **ADDENDUM**..... 42.

1. TELEVISED STATEMENTS of DEFENDANTS, CO-CONSPIRATORS: FROM COMPLAINT: PARTIAL LIST..... 42.
2. PHOTOGRAPHS and OTHER EVIDENCE..... 50.